3.

DEFENCE

OF THE RIGHT REVEREND THE

LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR.

BRITISH MUSEUM

A

DEFENCE

OF THE RIGHT REVEREND THE

LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR;

WITH

REMARKS

ON A

Moſt *Extraordinary* Trial.

BY THE

REV. RICE HUGHES, A. M.

DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE

EARL OF POULETT,

AND LATE OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WALKER, No. 44, Paternoſter-row.

M DCC XCVI.

[Price One Shilling and Sixpence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

PREFACE.

I HAVE on ſeveral occaſions oppoſed my humble talents to the riſing torrent of the licentiouſneſs of the times in morals and politics. Human depravity wears a ſingularly bold and daring feature in the wanton and wicked perſecutions of the Biſhop of Bangor. To delineate it in its proper colours; to eraſe it from the face of the moral world by ſhewing it in all its deformity, and to do juſtice to an injured man, will be the ſubject of the following ſheets.

Diffident of my poor abilities, I never obtrude any literary work on the public, unleſs on very urgent occaſions. In the preſent inſtance, indeed, I have repreſſed a ſtrong degree of impatience, in the hope that a more able advocate would appear to do juſtice to a ſubject, in which the well-being of ſociety, and the moſt eſſential in-

tereſts of every individual are ſo intimately interwoven. To develope this myſtery of iniquity is, at length, fallen to my lot.

I am aware unworthy motives will be imputed to this production. I muſt, therefore, obſerve, that I have not the honour of being at all known to the worthy prelate; and that I have been impelled to the undertaking *purely* from a profound ſenſe of the unmerited and *malicious* perſecutions of the Biſhop of Bangor—a ſeries of perſecutions of the moſt ſingular complexion in the records of our Courts of Judicature.

In the commencement of theſe diſgraceful tranſactions, I felt myſelf deeply intereſted. I marked the progreſſive ſteps and machinations of this dark conſpiracy to injure and oppreſs his Lordſhip. Had the Biſhop's moral character appeared in a queſtionable ſhape, his adverſaries would have a cloak to cover their deſign. The caſe is eminently the reverſe;—and his Judge bore this noble teſtimony, that, "*no doubt*, the Biſhop is a man of an *excellent* character,"—a character which the following

ſheets

ſheets will demonſtrate to be "equalled by few, exceeded by none!" The rays of truth will ſoon diſſipate the ſhade in which it has, for a moment, been enveloped by the artifices, and indefatigable induſtry of his enemies; and, like gold tried in the fire, will ſhine forth with pure luſtre, and ſterling worth.

In this view of injured innocence, and of the wicked attempts to aſſaſſinate the moſt venerable character, one of the firſt and beſt in the Chriſtian miniſtry, ſympathy, love, and admiration, muſt ſeize the heart of every reader;—reſentment and indignation will rouſe his feelings againſt a conſpiracy that will attach eternal diſgrace to an enlightened and abuſed people, eſpecially that portion of the public who live near the ſcene of action, and who have the proud appellation of antient Britons.

I was, myſelf, born in the dioceſe, and educated at the ſchool of Bangor. Feeling for the honour of my countrymen, as well as for the injured prelate, I have availed myſelf of every authentic channel for local

information on the ſubject, and have been fortunate in collecting a maſs of the moſt intereſting, important, and irrefragable facts, with a view, my countrymen, to diſſipate your prejudices, to rectify your miſconceptions, and to reſcue innocence from the envenomed ſhafts of its enemies.

For this purpoſe, therefore, I ſtrongly recommend the following work to the attentive peruſal of the public in general, and my countrymen in particular. If they conſider it with unprejudiced minds, they will ſee, that the Biſhop of Bangor is a moſt injured man.

RICE HUGHES.

London,
Aug. 30, 1796.

A DEFENCE, &c.

THE fate of the proſecutions againſt the Biſhop of Bangor and his friends having been determined by a verdict, and the trial having been publiſhed in as authentic a form as can be expected; it may now be permitted to one, who has not been an inattentive obſerver of what has been paſſing in the county of Caernarvon, to offer to the public ſome conſiderations on this extraordinary caſe. The writer feels, that he does not enter on this taſk with that ſpirit which produced and circulated, moſt induſtriouſly, though clandeſtinely, a ſcandalous, virulent, and malignant libel on the Biſhop, immediately before theſe charges were brought forward. That publication might have raiſed prejudices ſtrong enough to have influenced the determination, and ſo have poiſoned the very fountain of juſtice. That it was intended to produce that effect, and that the pamphlet, and the indictments, were parts of the ſame meaſure, cannot be doubted. If the pamphlet failed in its purpoſe, it was be-

cauſe

cauſe the folly, the malice, and the wickedneſs of it, were ſo thinly veiled, that all honeſt men ſaw through it, and treated it with the contempt which it ſo juſtly merited.

The preſent publication may aſſiſt the cauſe of truth and juſtice, but can miſlead no one. The principal facts are eſtabliſhed by the teſtimony of Mr. Grindley himſelf, or his own witneſſes, on oath, or are ſo notorious that they cannot be contradicted. If any one man hath ſeen them through a medium which may be falſe, it becomes the duty of another, who conceives that he can place them in the true point of view, to make the attempt.

It may naturally enough be aſked, what had the Biſhop of Bangor done to provoke this attack upon him? How much he had done to endear himſelf to all ranks of people in his dioceſe, thouſands can teſtify! What occaſion could he have given for ſuch a torrent of abuſe being firſt poured upon him, and afterwards followed up by proſecutions, which, from the nature of them, muſt be felt as the higheſt indignity which can be offered to a man in his ſtation?

It is often difficult to trace the malice of a bad heart to its true ſource.

If we knew with abſolute certainty who were the authors of the pamphlet, and who were the ſecret inſtigators of theſe proſecutions, it is probable that the queſtion might receive a diſtinct anſwer; perhaps, the time is not far diſtant when

this

this will be known—it is in train—theſe incendiaries know that it is in train.—At this moment they anticipate thoſe feelings which a conſciouſneſs of guilt detected creates; even now they are haunted in their dreams with proſecutions; already the Biſhop hath his revenge, if that paſſion could find its way to his breaſt. They made him feel, but he ſupported himſelf under his feelings, becauſe he was innocent; theſe men feel and tremble, becauſe they know that they are guilty.

In the mean time, I can only direct the attention of the reader to thoſe cauſes of offence which the pamphlet and the indictments ſuggeſt.

It cannot be denied, that, in the ſummer of the laſt year, the Biſhop of Bangor ſignified to the Lord Viſcount Bulkeley, that his brother, Sir Robert Williams, having had the misfortune to have a verdict paſs againſt him, at the Worceſter aſſizes, for criminal converſation with the wife of a gentleman of that county, he (the Biſhop) could not recommend to the clergy of his Dioceſe to give their ſupport to Sir Robert as a Candidate for the County of Caernarvon in the enſuing parliament, and that he thought they ought to ſupport Lord Penrhyn the other candidate. This, whatever demerit is to be attached to it, I believe the Biſhop has to anſwer for; beyond this, I believe, he had given no cauſe of offence to that Noble Lord, or his connexions; and ſurely, even in theſe days, it

was

was no reaſonable cauſe of quarrel with a Biſhop, who took any care of his dioceſe, that he exhorted his clergy not to expreſs, even at an election, an open contempt of the moral law, delivered by God himſelf to his people—"Thou ſhall not commit adultery:" Nor had the Biſhop given any new cauſe of offence, as I ever heard, to another Noble Lord who warmly eſpouſed the cauſe of Sir R. Williams. The Earl of Uxbridge, who upon ſome miſunderſtanding of an old date, had withdrawn his countenance and favor from the Biſhop; but who, doubtleſs, is of too noble a nature to harbour, and keep alive in his breaſt, for ſuch a length of time, that eager reſentment which burſt into ſuch a flame in this pamphlet.

One of thoſe miſunderſtandings between this Noble Lord and his agents, and the Biſhop of Bangor, reſpected the rebuilding the pariſh church of Amlwch, where the famous Paris Mountain and its copper mines are ſituated. The church was in a ruinous ſtate, and too ſmall for the number of the inhabitants. The proprietors of thoſe mines had brought into the pariſh a multitude of people, from whoſe labour they derived immenſe wealth. The Biſhop was of opinion, that the proprietors of the mines ſhould be at the expence of rebuilding the church; that they ought to do it for the public, who were doing ſo much for them. The Biſhop underſtood that it had been promiſed to him, that it

ſhould

ſhould be rebuilt at the expence of the proprietors. The Noble Earl and his agents, inſiſt that they undertook for no more than that they ſhould contribute a certain ſum towards the work. There was a miſtake ſomewhere; the memory is fallible; this need not have produced a quarrel; but they, into whoſe hands this pamphlet has fallen, will perceive, that it is made the ſubject of a quarrel with the Biſhop, which, for purpoſes we may gueſs at, is revived, with extraordinary vehemence and virulence at this critical time.

The Noble Earl had alſo taken offence, moſt unaccountably, at the exertions of the Biſhop to put the Grammar School at Bangor upon a good footing, which he effected at a very great expence to himſelf, and a large ſacrifice of his own time, he having himſelf ſuperintended the work from the beginning to the end. The Biſhop is amply rewarded—he has the happineſs to ſee the ſchool flouriſh under a very able maſter, whom he placed there, not without being under the neceſſity of making many arrangements, which, I ſhould not wonder, if the authors of the pamphlet called Simoniacal, in order to make room for him.

When the Biſhop came firſt to Bangor, there were four or five ragged boys in the ſchool, not very well taken care of; there are now eighty ſcholars of good connexions in the country

carefully

carefully educated. The town of Bangor, and the adjacent country, feel the immediate effects of an increaſed circulation. But this is, comparatively, a ſmall circumſtance. Let us look forward to the benefit, the incalculable benefit of an increaſed civilization, which this excellent proviſion of the means for well educating the riſing generation, in that part of the country, muſt produce.

Will it be believed that this is one of the grievances ſtated in this pamphlet? Fortunately, for the cauſe of truth, this charitable work, entered upon, and executed with ſo much generoſity and munificence, and upon motives which could not be miſunderſtood by any man, whoſe judgment was not warped by ſtrong and paſſionate prejudice;—this capital improvement of the Grammar School at Bangor is introduced, and made a ſubject for the moſt ſlanderous abuſe in this pamphlet;—fortunately, I ſay, for the cauſe of truth—ex pede Herculem—this enabled honeſt and fair men to take a juſt meaſure of the whole of that execrable performance.

With thoſe exceptions which may be collected from this ſhort hiſtory, and from this additional circumſtance, that the Biſhop judges for himſelf on whom he ſhall beſtow thoſe benefices of which he is the patron; and here the writer takes upon himſelf to aſſert, that the

Biſhop

Biſhop has, in no one inſtance, conferred a parochial benefice on a clergyman who was not maſter of the Welch Language; and that, in many inſtances, he has beſtowed them on thoſe who, for thirty years, had been the curates, ſtarving upon a miſerable ſtipend; and who, having no *election* intereſt, had no friend but the Biſhop; with theſe exceptions, I apprehend, that the Biſhop might reaſonably conclude himſelf to be, and probably was, upon that footing with his clergy, and with his dioceſe, which his care and protection of his clergy, his hoſpitality, and his friendly offices to the country in general, entitled him to be.

In this ſtate of things, very unexpectedly indeed it muſt have been to him, this libellous pamphlet appeared; this maſked battery opened upon him—the guns all loaded to the very muzzle with langrige—falſehoods of all ſorts ſtuffed into it, mixed with a very ſmall proportion of diſtorted truths, juſt enough to give it ſome conſiſtence, and to make people endure to read it.

The object was ſufficiently apparent, but the Biſhop was a man of too much conſtancy to be driven from his ground by this baſe and treacherous attack. (Some of the parties concerned will feel what I mean by the word treacherous.) Then followed this meaſure of a legal proceeding againſt the Biſhop and his friends, in the form of indictments, preferred at the Grand Seſſions

Seſſions held at Conway, and found by the Grand Jury, whoſe *foreman was Sir Robert Williams!*

I will do the authors of this meaſure the juſtice to acknowledge, that this was a maſterſtroke; the wit of man, ſharpened by the malice of the devil, could not have deviſed an engine more likely to diſtreſs the Biſhop, and to bend him to their purpoſes; any public imputation upon his conduct, the poſſibility of his conduct being ſo miſrepreſented by falſe witneſſes, or ſo miſunderſtood by a Judge and Jury, that he might have to appear in a Court of Juſtice as a convicted delinquent, as one who had entirely forgotten the duties of his ſtation, and had violated the laws of his country, could not be reflected on without horror by the moſt conſtant men of that order and rank in the State:—The thought of it was almoſt inſupportable. To be relieved from the anxiety which this ſtate of accuſation muſt produce, the very beſt of us would feel inclined to think worth purchaſing upon almoſt any terms. This was, therefore, what was exultingly called a "*grand operation.*"

Some of the ſteps taken to ſecure the ſucceſs of this *grand operation* have tranſpired. Such ſecrets are generally ill kept,—they do no honour to the parties concerned. Some of thoſe parties perceived that ſuch ſteps would do them no honour; and, I verily believe, were unwillingly dragged into the participation of them. One of them

them in particular, who, with all his faults, is a good-humoured man, and of *modern* honour, I am confident would rather have gone a hundred miles another way, than have been ſeen at Conway on ſuch an occaſion;—*but the ſerpent beguiled him, and he did eat.*

The face of things was now very much changed. The abuſe of an anonymous writer might be deſpiſed and overlooked. There was now a formal charge of high miſdemeanors againſt the Biſhop, with a proſecutor to avow them; and, ("tell it not in Gath, publiſh it not in Aſkalon") it had received the ſolemn ſanction of the preſentment of a grand inqueſt;—that branch of our criminal juriſdiction which has hitherto been conſidered as the palladium of Engliſhmen; as that which was effectually to guard them againſt that worſt of evils—the courſe of the law of the land proſtituted to unworthy purpoſes.

Two indictments were preferred: the firſt againſt the Biſhop alone, for an aſſault on one Roberts, a blackſmith, whom Mr. Grindley had thought proper to aſſociate with him in the cuſtody of the Regiſtrar's Office. The ſecond, againſt the Biſhop, with four others, charging a Right Reverend Prelate, Biſhop of the Dioceſe, a dignified Clergyman, the Archdeacon of Merioneth, two other very reſpectable Clergymen, and a Layman, a gentleman practiſing the law, who had ſucceeded Mr. Grindley as agent to the Biſhop, with having been guilty of a

riot; with having riotouſly aſſaulted Mr. Grindley, and with having inſtigated ſeveral perſons, riotouſly aſſembled, to remove and expel Mr. Grindley by force, from the Regiſtrar's Office.

Such an aſſembly of rioters, one might have expected to have found grouped in a licentious farce; but it was reſerved for thoſe who inſtigated Mr. Grindley to commence this proſecution, to introduce living characters of ſuch a deſcription into an indictment for ſuch an offence.

Theſe indictments having been found by the Grand Inqueſt for the county of Caernarvon, the Biſhop had this alternative, either to ſhrink from all further inquiry, and make his peace with his enemies, on ſuch terms as they ſhould be *graciouſly* pleaſed to grant unto him, or to meet the charges with firmneſs. He did not heſitate for a moment; he choſe the latter, and put himſelf upon his country, to the no ſmall mortification of his adverſaries, who had flattered themſelves they had taken their meaſures ſo well, that the Biſhop would be driven to an unconditional ſubmiſſion.

Another cruel diſappointment ſoon followed: The inſtigators of theſe proſecutions had made themſelves quite ſure, that the trial of the indictments muſt be had in the county of Caernarvon. When feeling in their own perſons to what a pitch men could be worked up by an election ſpirit, it is not quite impoſſible but that they

they might derive hopes of ſucceſs from that circumſtance. They found themſelves defeated, and had the additional mortification to diſcover, that they had defeated themſelves. That their own practices,—the circulation of that abominable pamphlet, had not only made it neceſſary, but had given the Biſhop a right, to remove the indictments, and to bring them on to trial in the next Engliſh county. They found that theſe cauſes would be to be tried by a Jury compoſed of men of the firſt rank in the county of Salop, men who were not dipped in the wretched politics of the Caernarvon election. All the pains they had taken to prejudice the county againſt the Biſhop were now perceived to be thrown away. They could not cheat themſelves into the fond hope that ſuch men would imbibe narrow prejudices. There are, however, prejudices which generous minds might feel; and thoſe men began to apprehend that their labours might operate againſt themſelves; for they could hardly hope that an indifferent Jury, men of honour, could conſider the pamphlet, and their proſecutions coupled together, as any thing ſhort of a foul conſpiracy againſt the honour, I might add, againſt the life of the Biſhop of Bangor. No man could have been ſurprized, if he had ſunk under the weight of ſo much vexatious perſecution.

The hiſtory of the paſſages which were made the colour for the ridiculous charge of a riot, may be, in a great meaſure, collected from the trial which has been publiſhed.

Mr. Grindley related them upon oath. Mr. Grindley was examined, and croſs-examined. The Jury were immediately ſatisfied! They acquitted the defendants *with the entire approbation of the Bar*, and with the hearty concurrence of a large and moſt reſpectable auditory.

This was a ſtunning defeat, not only to thoſe who were immediately concerned in the *grand operation*, but to a *malignant* party who had rejoiced in ſeeing men whom they hated, almoſt as cordially as they do the Biſhops, in doing their work for them, preparing the way for their own deſtruction, by degrading the hierarchy in the perſon of one of the Biſhops, and ſo undermining one of the pillars of the Conſtitution. In this reſpect, a victory would have been dearly bought by theſe ſhort-ſighted politicians who are too angry to be wiſe. Of this they had given ſufficient proofs a ſhort time before, when they did buy a victory at a price which ſome of their beſt friends have thought rather extravagant. Had but one ray of common ſenſe illumined the dark corners in North Wales, they might have avoided the diſgrace, both of their victory, and of their defeat.

What now was to be done? This verdict threatened to put an end to the ſhort but diſaſtrous reign of that tyrannic election ſpirit, which can brook no oppoſition to its *lordly* will, and would ſtoop to any thing in order to gratify its rancor; ſomething was to be thought of.

This

This only remained. Great pains have been taken to publiſh, that the learned Judge, who tried this cauſe, ſummed up the evidence favourably for the proſecution, and that he did not approve of this verdict. The publiſhers of this information to the public have the authority of the trial, as now printed, for the aſſertion; and I have no authority to deny that ſuch was the ſumming-up of the learned Judge.

I have too profound a reverence for the Judges of England, and have too much perſonal reſpect for the learned Judge in particular, to treat his opinions lightly: But I claim the privilege of examining them decently and gravely, and of convicting them of error, if they ſhall be found to be erroneous. The importance, nay the abſolute neceſſity of ſuch an enquiry, is obvious. Thoſe men, who have ſo induſtriouſly circulated the opinion of the learned Judge, know full well the influence it muſt have upon the public, and therefore they have circulated it. If the opinion is well founded, it will have (I agree it ought to have) its weight. If it is erroneous, it ought to be reverſed, as far as, in the nature of the thing, it can be reverſed; and the Biſhop ought to be reſtored to ſo much of the public opinion as he has loſt by this error. I am informed that there is no courſe of law in which this error can be examined, and an authoritative reverſal had of the judgment, if I may ſo call it, of the learned Judge. If it is ſuffered to paſs

current in the world, the miſchief is irreparable. The promoters of theſe indictments, ſo countenanced, may preſume to ſhew their heads again, and the benefit of ſuch an example of malice, detected and defeated, may be in a manner loſt. It is, therefore, a juſtice due to the Biſhop and his friends, who have not the full benefit of their acquittal; it is due to the Jury, who lie under a ſort of imputation, as if they had given a verdict againſt law, and againſt evidence; it is due to the community at large, who ought to enjoy the full protection which this verdict holds out to them againſt calumnious and malicious proſecutions; that what is now publiſhed as the opinion of the learned Judge ſhould undergo an examination.

The principal object of this little tract is to enable thoſe, to whom the opinion of the learned Judge may be offered as an apology for the proſecution, to judge of the weight it ought to have.

I think the faireſt courſe I can take, and that which will be the leaſt diſreſpectful to the learned Judge, will be to endeavour to collect and arrange the evidence, and to place it in ſuch points of view, as may ſerve to aſſiſt thoſe who read the trial, to underſtand the true import of it. When this is underſtood, every man may judge for himſelf, whether it was ſeen in its true light by the learned Judge, and whether they can go along with him in his way of applying it to the charge. I will

not preſume to oppoſe myſelf perſonally to the learned Judge; I will aſſert nothing; I will not ſay that the learned Judge miſtook the caſe from the beginning to the end; that many very material parts of it eſcaped his notice altogether; that many facts were aſſumed by the learned Judge as proved, which reſted upon evidence ſo contradictory, that in order to come at the fact, it was abſolutely neceſſary to weigh the credit of the reſpective witneſſes, and the comparative probabilities of their reſpective evidence; and to decide, which of three different ſtories was to be believed. I will not aſſert, that when the learned Judge aſſumed the province of the Jury, he found his verdict palpably againſt the weight of the evidence; I will only deſire that the evidence may be read and conſidered, and will leave it to thoſe who will read and conſider it, to draw their own concluſions.

In diſcourſing upon this ſubject, I ſhall proceed in the method I have been uſed to. I propoſe, firſt, to ſtate the ſubſtance of that part of the evidence which had no contrariety in it, I ſhall conſider the facts to which that part of the evidence applies as proved, and I ſhall ſtate, what I conceive to be, the reſult of thoſe facts with reference to the charge in this indictment; I ſhall then ſtate the evidence in which there is a contrariety; the different repreſentations of thoſe facts which are differently repreſented by the

witneſſes. I ſhall conſider which of thoſe repreſentations is ſupported by the weight of the evidence; and when the fact is, by this proceſs, ſufficiently aſcertained, I ſhall, as in the former part of the caſe, conſider how it will apply to the charge, and then, as we ſay, I ſhall conclude with ſome practical inferences from the whole.

Firſt, then, the evidence diſtinctly proves that Mr. Grindley acted as the Deputy Regiſtrar, under the direction of the Biſhop, without any appointment from the principal Regiſtrar. I ſhall not ſtay to enquire whether, in the language of the indictment, he was duly appointed. That is a matter of law, and much out of my reach. But if he was duly appointed, it muſt have been by the Biſhop, for certainly he had no appointment from any one elſe; and it appears by the evidence, that the Principal Regiſtrar left every thing belonging to the execution of the office entirely to the Biſhop. Mr. Grindley had been the Biſhop's agent; the Biſhop had removed him from his agency. In the trial there is an alluſion to the *cauſe* of his removal. The Judge interpoſed (I dare ſay very properly)—they were not then to enter into Mr. Grindley's private affairs! The Biſhop withdrew from the office his ſeal, which, by the way, ought, as I conceive, to be in the cuſtody of the Chancellor of the dioceſe, or of his Surrogate, and ought never to have been in the cuſtody of the Regiſtrar.

It is not diſtinctly proved, but may be collected from the evidence, that the Biſhop had likewiſe called upon Mr. Grindley to give up his ſituation of Deputy Regiſtrar. It muſt have been a very diſagreeable thing to him to have a man about him in the reſponſible ſituation of Regiſtrar, who had not his confidence. Mr. Grindley felt the propriety of his giving it up, and only put off the day. Probably the Biſhop thought that Mr. Grindley was trifling with him; and the event, as ſtated by Mr. Adam, Mr. Griindley's counſel, has proved that he was trifling with him, for he pretends to keep the office to this hour. The Biſhop ſeems to have made up his mind, that Mr. Grindley ought to quit the office immediately upon his requiſition. He demanded the key, which was refuſed to him. He ordered the door to be opened, and a new lock to be put upon it, which was done without perſonal violence to any one. Mr. Grindley being informed of this, armed himſelf with fire-arms, got together his two clerks, two ſervants armed with ſticks, and a blackſmith, whom he was alſo pleaſed to call his ſervant, armed with ſome of the implements of his calling, and broke open the outer door of the office alſo without perſonal violence to any one; but there Jones, the Biſhop's agent, interpoſing, putting his back to the inner door, and endeavouring to prevent Mr. Grindley forcing

his

his way into the office, Mr. Grindley confeſſes that he aſſaulted him, and removed him by force and perſonal violence. His cries alarmed the Biſhop's ſervants; Raſbrook came forward; Mr. Grindley preſented his piſtol, and threatened to ſhoot him;—he retired. Mr. Grindley finiſhed his work, forced his way into the inner room, and the outer door was then cloſed from within. After ſome time the Biſhop knocked at the door, and demanded to be admitted; Mr. Grindley ſaid, he would ſhoot any man who ſhould force the door. The Biſhop ſaid, "Will you ſhoot the Biſhop?" and again demanded to be admitted; Mr. Grindley opened the door, and the Biſhop entered. It was market-day, though one of the witneſſes repreſented it otherwiſe, and ſeveral people had collected round the door.

Thus far the fact is plain. Let us make a pauſe here, and take a ſurvey of this part of the evidence, and ſee to what it reſults.

Leaving the queſtion to be decided hereafter in the proper juriſdiction, whether Mr. Grindley was, in ſtrict law, any thing more than a ſervant under the Biſhop, whom he might diſmiſs at his pleaſure, I think it moſt manifeſt that the Biſhop conſidered him as his ſervant, put into the office by himſelf, who had the management of the concerns of the office for his relation the Regiſtrar, a minor; and that in truth he was himſelf reſponſible

ſponſible, both to his relation and to the public, for the office being properly taken care of by the perſon whom he ſhould think fit, from time to time, to place in it,—that he had a right to remove Mr. Grindley at his pleaſure, from a ſituation which Mr. Grindley held, as he conceived, only during his pleaſure; that having appointed the deputy Regiſtrar as he had appointed his agent, he concluded that he might diſmiſs his deputy Regiſtrar as he had diſmiſſed his agent; and when he ordered the office to be opened, and a new lock to be put on the door, he did not mean to act arbitrarily, but did juſt what he would have done if his butler had taken away the key of his plate-cheſt, and had refuſed to deliver it to him.

On the other hand, Mr. Grindley might, by poſſibility, entertain a conceit that the Biſhop had no right ſo to remove him; (ſtrange as it ſeems to a man unlearned in the law, that it ſhould be made a queſtion, whether the man who appoints may not remove a mere ſervant) or by poſſibility, Mr. Grindley might have been adviſed by his new friends, whom, between the 4th and the 8th, he had a convenient opportunity of conſulting, to try to make ſomething out of this circumſtance of the Biſhop ordering the door to be opened, which, if the Biſhop had no right to remove Mr. Grindley at his pleaſure, might amount in law to a treſpaſs. It is not for me

to

to ſay whether it could, or it could not, be conſidered as a treſpaſs; but I may ſay, that the tranſactions of the 4th were not the tranſactions of the 8th; and that the force made uſe of on the 4th, to get poſſeſſion of the office, ought not to be confounded with the force ſuppoſed to have been employed on the 8th, to diſpoſſeſs Mr. Grindley.

I proceed to obſerve, that when Mr. Grindley took upon himſelf to poſſeſs himſelf of the office by force, and with perſonal violence offered both to Jones and Raſbrook, threatening the life of the latter, apparently he committed a very great breach of the peace, in which were many of the ingredients of that tumult and riot with which he afterwards thought fit to charge the Biſhop. Whether, ſuppoſing Mr. Grindley had happened to be indicted, he could have juſtified what he did, would, as I am informed, depend on two queſtions, and he would have had very up-hill work in both of them. The firſt queſtion would be, whether he had any right to the poſſeſſion; and the ſecond, whether he aſſerted his right in a lawful manner? Another, and perhaps a more efficacious mode of defence, and which Mr. Grindley was adviſed to adopt, was to indict the Biſhop.

Here I will leave Mr. Grindley for the preſent, and return to the Biſhop.

It will be remembered, that the Biſhop did not approach the place till after one of his ſervants had been inſulted and beaten, and the life of his other ſervant Raſbrook threatened, by a man who had forced his way into the office with arms in his hands, and was there ſurrounded by people, ſome of them of the very loweſt condition, and very unfit to be left in the repoſitory of the records and archives of this dioceſe.

It does not appear what repreſentation had been made to the Biſhop of that which was paſſing in the office; but it is fair to ſuppoſe, that all which had paſſed had been communicated to him, perhaps with the aggravations which uſually accompany the communication of extraordinary events by ordinary relators.

Now I aſk, and I put it to every ſerious reader of the trial, to collect from the circumſtances, for what purpoſe did the Biſhop come there? Can it be imagined that he came there with an intent to diſpoſſeſs Mr. Grindley by force and violence? I am ready to concede, that he was ſtrongly prepoſſeſſed with an opinion that Mr. Grindley had no right to be there, having been diſmiſſed by him; that his forcing his way into the office muſt have appeared to the Biſhop to be a very outrageous proceeding of a diſcarded ſervant; that he felt himſelf affronted and inſulted, and that he was extremely angry; ſtill I aſk, for what purpoſe did the Biſhop come

come there? I will anſwer this queſtion by putting another: For what purpoſe ought a man in his high ſtation, a preacher of peace on earth, and good-will towards men, a man, whom every conſideration would urge to interpoſe for the preſervation of good order, and whom nothing ought to provoke to mix in perſonal conteſts of any kind; for what purpoſe ought ſuch a man to have interpoſed? Shall it not be preſumed in the favour of ſuch a man, until a cloud of witneſſes force upon us a different impreſſion, that he did interpoſe to put a ſtop to a tumult which might have endangered the ſafety of the office, and the lives of the people aſſembled.

The preſence, and the perſonal interpoſition of great magiſtrates, and of grave men in high ſtations, have at all times been conſidered as uſeful, and even neceſſary, on every appearance of tumult and riot; and they generally produce the happieſt effects: the very appearance of the Roman Senator ſitting in his curule chair, and adorned with all the enſigns of his dignities, almoſt diſarmed the ferocious, blood-thirſty Gaul: "You will not ſhoot your Biſhop," were the firſt words addreſſed to this riotous man, who had created all this confuſion.

Other conſiderations might very probably mix themſelves with this primary object—the putting an end to the tumult which Grindley had raiſed: probably the Biſhop thought, that by ſhewing himſelf

himſelf there, and publicly diſavowing Grindley as his officer, he ſhould induce Grindley to deſiſt from further aſſerting, what the Biſhop ſurely muſt be allowed to have conſidered, as a moſt unwarrantable claim—the claim to be in poſſeſſion of this office againſt his will. The Biſhop might have perſuaded himſelf, that on a requiſition made to him in a determined tone and manner, Mr. Grindley and his myrmidons would have the decency to abandon their plan of keeping poſſeſſion of the office by force, and would retire; and that, by thoſe means, peace might be reſtored.

But did the Biſhop unarmed, aſſiſted by three Clergymen unarmed, and attended by his agent Jones unarmed, intend by force and violence to remove and expel Mr. Grindley from the office? a man whom he muſt have thought frantic, from what had been reported to him of his behaviour; a man who, he knew, was armed with a deadly weapon, and was ſupported by a ſet of ruffians; unarmed, did I ſay? Oh! but the Biſhop afterwards put on his coat of mail, and armed himſelf to the very teeth; he ſent for a Juſtice of the Peace, and a Conſtable—*Riſum teneatis amici!*

I proceed to the conſideration of the ſubſequent part of the evidence:

Here the facts will be to be collected from the evidence of three or four witneſſes, who being examined

examined ſeparately, in parts of their evidence contradict one another ſo materially, that a conſcientious Jury could hardly give credit, with entire ſatisfaction to their own minds, to any part of their teſtimony.

The witneſſes all agree in one ſtory thus far—that the Biſhop entered the office in a great rage, and with his fiſts clenched; which, in a boxer, might be a poſture of offence, but they differ widely, as to what he ſaid and did. Mr. Grindley, as might be expected, makes the ſtrongeſt charge againſt the Biſhop. He repreſents the Biſhop as coming up to him in a great rage, and ſaying—"Fine work! you ſhall not ſtay here; I will turn you out immediately." He ſays, he anſwered, "My Lord, I ſhall certainly behave with due reſpect to your Lordſhip, but I will not leave the office." He ſays, the Biſhop took hold of him, that he went from him to his huſbandman, (William Roberts) and then went and laid hold of David Roberts, another of his ſervants, and attempted to pull him out of the office; then returned to William Roberts, *took him by the collar*, and puſhed him towards the door; that the Biſhop came up to him, (Grindley) as he deſcribed it, with his hands clenched, *holding them up before his breaſt*, and ſaid he would turn him out, and that he called to his ſervants and ſaid, come and take them out.

Pritchard's

Pritchard's account is, that the Biſhop ſeemed to be in a very violent paſſion, that he followed Grindley into the office, and clenched his fiſts, deſcribing *his hands hanging down by his ſides*; that he ſaid to Grindley, "fine work, fine work;" Grindley ſaid, "ſo it is, my Lord, breaking open my office in this manner." "Your office?" ſaid the Biſhop, "you have nothing to do with it, you have no buſineſs here; I inſiſt upon your going out." Being aſked a queſtion reſpecting William Roberts, and Robert Davis, he ſaid ſomebody, the Chaplain or ſomebody elſe, aſked who are thoſe fellows, who are thoſe ruffians? He ſaid, the Biſhop went up to William Roberts, and laid hold of him, deſcribing it to be *taking hold of his ſhoulder*, and puſhed him towards the door; he ſaid, he ſaw nothing done to Davis.

Thomas ſwore, that the Biſhop came in ſtamping his feet, and walked towards Grindley and ſaid, "fine work, fine work,;"—Grindley repeated, "yes, fine work in breaking open my office; whoever did it ſhall repent it." The Biſhop ſaid, "your office? *you have no right to be here—you muſt quit it immediately*," or words to that effect. Grindley ſaid, he had a right to be there. The witneſs ſaid the Biſhop went towards Grindley very often, *as if he had a mind, as he thought*, to collar him. He ſaid, the Biſhop ordered his people to turn Roberts out, and deſired that he

make out. He faſtened at his collar, and grappled at him, and wanted to puſh him towards the door. He ſaid he did not ſee him do any thing to any other perſon.

Being aſked, on his croſs-examination, how the Biſhop moved his hands? he deſcribed it *with his hands down by his ſides*; and he mentioned a circumſtance not noticed by Grindley, that while the Biſhop was in the office, Grindley ſerved him with a writ, and that the Biſhop ſaid he would anſwer it.

Upon comparing this evidence, Grindley ſtands alone in repreſenting the Biſhop to have laid hold of him. Thomas went thus far—that the Biſhop went towards Grindley, as if he had a mind (as the witneſs thought) to collar him. Pritchard ſaw nothing that approached towards it. It is obſervable how this is worked up: That which Thomas choſe to fancy the Biſhop had a mind to do, Mr. Grindley had no difficulty in ſwearing that he did do.

Grindley repreſents the Biſhop with his fiſts clenched, and his arms raiſed to his breaſt; the others ſay, the arms were hanging down by his ſides. Grindley ſays, the Biſhop laid hold of Robert Davis; the other two witneſſes ſaw no ſuch thing, and the three witneſſes gave three different accounts of what, they ſay, the Biſhop did to William Roberts, the ruffian blackſmith, of whom nobody would give any account, when

it

it was aſked who thoſe fellows were? Grindley ſays, the Biſhop took him by the collar, and puſhed him towards the door: Thomas ſaid, the Biſhop ordered his people to turn Roberts out, and deſired that he would *make out*; he faſtened at his collar, and grappled at him, and wanted to puſh him towards the door: Pritchard's accounts is, that he went up to Roberts; and laid hold of him, deſcribing it to be *taking hold of his ſhoulder*, and puſhed him towards the door. There is ſuch a difference between taking a man by the collar and putting the hand upon the ſhoulder, that all theſe accounts cannot be true; if either of them were true, ſurely it muſt have been the laſt, for a reaſon, which every body, except Mr. Grindley and his friends, will acknowledge the force of; becauſe the action ſo deſcribed beſt compots with the habits and manners of a Gentleman in the ſituation they deſcribe the Biſhop to have been; and in truth, amounts to no more than, "go, my friend, you have no buſineſs here;" or in Thomas's vulgar language, *make out*; which by the way, nobody can believe were the words actually uſed by the Biſhop.

Grindley charges the Biſhop with ſaying, "I will turn you out," and with calling to his people to turn him, and thoſe who were with him, out; for that is the effect of his evidence: but, according to Pritchard, his expreſſion was, "I inſiſt upon

your going out." Thomas's account is ſubſtantially the ſame as Pritchard's. He makes the Biſhop ſay, "you muſt quit immediately," and both of them differ eſſentially from Grindley in their accounts of what led to the Biſhop's uſing any expreſſion of this kind. Grindley repreſents him to have at once declared, that he would turn him out, without a word having been ſaid on his part—"fine work, you ſhall not ſtay here, I will turn you out immediately;" and it is not by inadvertence that he ſo ſtates it. It was to mark that he came there with that intention, and for that purpoſe. But the account given by the two other witneſſes is, that what the Biſhop ſaid was in reply to ſomething which had fallen from Grindley. When the Biſhop had, certainly with great emotion, characterized this riotous proceeding of Grindley's by the expreſſion, "Yes, fine work, fine work;" Grindley inſolently retorted, "fine work in breaking open my office." Then it was the Biſhop ſaid, "your office? you have no buſineſs here; I inſiſt upon your going out immediately," according to one of the witneſſes: "Your office? You have no right to be here—you muſt quit it immediately," according to the other witneſs.

Suppoſing the thing tohave paſſed, as Pritchard and Thomas ſay it did paſs, Grindley has given a moſt malicious turn to it. For ſurely, it is a very different thing, whether the Biſhop ſaid, with nothing to lead to it, "you ſhall not

ſtay

ſtay here—I will turn you out immediately;" or whether being called upon, by Grindley's publicly aſſerting the office to be his; the Biſhop denied it and ſaid, "he had no buſineſs there, or had no right to be there, and inſiſted upon his going out immediately, or that he muſt quit it immediately." Grindley's manner of relating the circumſtance ſerved a double purpoſe. It was to prove, out of the Biſhop's own mouth, with what intent he came there; and alſo to prove, that he meant to proceed immediately to carry that intent into execution. The account of the other two witneſſes ſerves neither of theſe purpoſes. It was at moſt but a ſtrong requiſition to Grindley to go, which had been called for, by Grindley's aſſerting his right to be there; and left it quite open and undetermined what the Biſhop would do next, if Grindley did not comply with that requiſition.

Grindley, in confirmation of his teſtimony, ſaid, that the Biſhop called to his ſervants to turn them (including himſelf) out. This alſo, if Pritchard and Thomas ſpeak truth, is a malicious turn given to the evidence; for they both agree in repreſenting the Biſhop to have called to have the two ruffians, as they were denominated, and particularly the ruffian Roberts, the blackſmith, turned out, and not Grindley.

Grindley is a great lawyer; having made his charge, it was neceſſary to prove it an act of

perſonal violence offered by the Biſhop to himſelf, accompanied with a declaration, that the Biſhop would himſelf turn him out immediately. This would go a great way towards involving the Biſhop in the charge of coming in to the office with an intent to remove Grindley by force; and with having proceeded to execute that intent, and with having committed a breach of the peace in the execution of it. Grindley ſwore to this aſſault, and to this declaration. His witneſſes not only did not ſupport him, but gave ſuch an explanation of the circumſtances upon which Grindley relies, that they do in effect contradict him in every particular.

I aſk then, did the Biſhop aſſault Grindley? Did he lay hold of him? Did he come up to him with his hands clenched, and raiſed to his breaſt? Did he ſay he would turn Grindley out? Did he call his ſervants to turn Grindley out? I conceive, that no body could anſwer theſe queſtions, with reference to this cauſe, and as a ground for the verdict that was to be pronounced in it, but that Jury who tried this cauſe. I conceive, that it was fit and neceſſary that theſe queſtions ſhould have been put diſtinctly to the Jury, with ſuch obſervations upon this contrariety in the evidence as occurred to the learned Judge. And here, where ſo much depended upon the credit of Mr. Grindley's teſtimony, there was room for obſerving who Mr. Grindley was; Under what circumſtances he

appeared

appeared as the profecutor of an indictment againſt the Biſhop of Bangor, his maſter and his friend, while he deſerved to have ſuch a friend. The Jury, judging for themſelves, as it was their duty to do, have anſwered theſe queſtions; they have by their verdict anſwered every one of them in the negative. Mr. Grindley cannot complain, if they have believed his witneſſes; the world will not complain, if they have rejected the whole teſtimony as a heap of traſh, a tiſſue of abſurdities. In either caſe they will have decided upon the fact honeſtly, according to the weight of the evidence.

Taking the caſe ſtripped of Mr. Grindley's aggravations, and as his witneſſes have repreſented it, Good God! what is it which has produced a charge of a riot againſt a Biſhop of the Church of England? The Biſhop hearing that Grindley had broke into the office by force, and with perſonal violence to one of his ſervants; that he was armed with a deadly weapon, and had threatened the life of another of his ſervants, and that he had a gang of ruffians with him in the office, apprehenſive of a tumult and danger to the records, and alſo to the lives of the people aſſembled, went haſtily and in great emotion, feeling himſelf perſonally inſulted, to the place; and there demanded of Grindley that he ſhould go out of the office. He ſent for a Juſtice of the Peace and a Conſtable (a cir-

cumſtance which ſeems to have eſcaped the learned Judge altogether) and ſeeing two people in the office, who could have no buſineſs there, two ruffian-looking men, ordered them to be turned out, and himſelf gave one of them a puſh towards the door, and at length, finding that Grindley peremptorily refuſed to quit the office, and that he could not be removed without violence, he himſelf withdrew, perſuaded (if Mr. Grindley pleaſes) by the ladies of his family, leaving Grindley in poſſeſſion.

Againſt Mr. Grindley this might have been made ſomething of. There was on his part a forcible entry, and perhaps, ſome color for charging him and his gang with a riot. But to turn the tables on the Biſhop, and to make him the rioter, ſeems to be a moſt marvellous perverſion of things, dexterouſly enough conducted, for it has deceived the very elect, but ſurely marked by no vulgar profligacy.

The poor Archdeacon too, for as to all the other defendants, I take leave to ſay, that there is not a tittle of evidence againſt them; notwithſtanding Doctor Owen, they ſay, both talked and laughed; the Archdeacon of Merioneth is involved in this riot. "Why, what evil hath he done?" They ſay, he threatened to turn them all out: He ſaid he would turn out Grindley himſelf, if no one elſe would. They ſay he ſwaggered, opened his breaſt, bid Grindley ſhoot him inſtead of the Biſhop, called out Grindley by way of challenge,

lenge, as the witneſs conjectured. If this part of the caſe were worthy of a minute diſcuſſion, the evidence, as to theſe particulars, is open to much obſervation; but I ſhall not ſtay to break a fly upon a wheel; probably enough, my countryman's blood might be fired at the indignity offered to his ſuperior, to whom he looked up with reverence and the moſt dutiful attachment. They ſay he bared his breaſt to receive the ſhot which might have been aimed at the Biſhop. Did he? Honeſt, generous creature, I honor him for it; the like charity might cover a multitude of ſins. If he did actually threaten, it was but a threat—a ſwagger, as the witneſs contemptuouſly termed it. If in the heat of his zeal he even challenged Grindley, ſurely this was but perſonal intemperance, for which in his own perſon he would be to anſwer. I do not perceive in the evidence, that he applied to the Biſhop to be his ſecond. In ſhort, the whole of this evidence is too ridiculous to be made the ground of a joint charge of any offence whatever; and it is as like an ouzle or a camel, as it is like a riot in the worthy Archdeacon,

Did not then the Jury do right in pronouncing the verdict which they did pronounce; and if any man thought that they ought to have given a different verdict, was he not egregiouſly miſtaken; and what apology can his miſtake furniſh for the malice of a diabolical plan to ruin

the

the character, and deſtroy the peace and happineſs, of any man, were he the meaneſt individual in the county of Caernarvon, for the ſake of their election.

I ought not to cloſe this examination of the evidence, without doing all I can to prevent my concluſions being preſſed beyond their proper bearing. I lament ſincerely, that there was a neceſſity for making any mention of the learned Judge who tried this cauſe; but I rely on the candor and generoſity of his mind, if it is diſcovered there is ſolid ground to impute error to his ſumming up, I am confident he will rejoice that this method hath been taken to provide a remedy for the wrong which that error hath produced. I impute nothing to the learned Judge but error in judgment, from which the beſt and wiſeſt are not exempt. I ſolemnly declare that I do not mean to inſinuate any reproach of partiality;—thank God! the integrity of our Judges is above all ſuſpicion. I go further; I verily believe, that if the learned judge could have intentionally yielded to any bias, it muſt have been on the ſide of the Biſhop. I apprehend that his principles and his connections lean that way. I have no doubt but that he was determined to reſiſt all thoſe general impreſſions which he could foreſee might tend to miſlead his judgment; but in throwing his mind into the oppoſite ſcale, has he not been acted upon, without

out perceiving it, by a ſtrong biaſs the other way? I have often heard it ſaid, I would rather have my judge my enemy than my friend. Does not this caſe furniſh ſome evidence of the truth of the adage.

In a caſe of leſs magnitude, where a Judge had felt himſelf more at his eaſe, I think it muſt have occurred to him to examine the outline of it, and to weigh the probabilities on one ſide and on the other.

Biſhops being but men, have the frailties of men; but ſurely it was improbable, that a man of the Biſhop of Bangor's age, of his profeſſion, and of his rank in his profeſſion, ſhould have left his houſe with an intention perſonally to engage in a Welſh brawl;—or that he would have been preſent, or would have taken any part, but for the expreſs purpoſe of reſtoring peace and good order; to me it appears ſo groſsly improbable, that the contrary ought to have been preſumed;—and the evidence which was offered to repel that preſumption, and to eſtabliſh a fact almoſt incredible, ſhould at leaſt have been ſcanned with a jealous eye. No wonder the minds of the Jury revolted at every concluſion the learned Judge drew from ſuch evidence. Had the learned Judge but traced in his own mind the outline of the tale which was to fix this grievous imputation upon the Biſhop, he muſt have perceived the wickedneſs of the attempt. What had Mr.

Grindley

Grindley to complain of? The Biſhop being refuſed acceſs to the Regiſtrar's office, ordered the door to be opened, and a new lock to be put upon it. Mr. Grindley armed himſelf and redreſſed himſelf. His violence alarmed the people;—he preſented his loaded piſtol, threatening to ſhoot any man who ſhould moleſt him. The people retired; Mr. Grindley remained in poſſeſſion, and has been in poſſeſſion ever ſince. What perſonal, what pecuniary injury has he ſuffered? Has he not been a great gainer? If he has loſt the confidence of the Biſhop of Bangor, in return he gained that of other *great* and *far more magnificent perſonages!* The Earl of Uxbridge has been exceedingly kind to him ever ſince, and, I am told, has even condeſcended to permit him to have a corner in his Lordſhip's carriage, when his affairs called him to London, a very ſhort time before this famous cauſe was to be tried at Shrewſbury. Of what does Mr. Grindley complain? Of that for which, had he brought his action, one *penny* damages had probably been deemed too ample a ſatisfaction. Why has he preferred his complaint in the form of an indictment? The anſwer is ready:—Becauſe in that form it will ſerve the purpoſes of the election for the county of Caernarvon.

If the caſe had preſented itſelf to the learned Judge in this point of view, I am perſuaded that he would have given no countenance to this proſecution; he would not have ſuffered a court

of

of juſtice in which he preſided to have been an inſtrument in the hands of Mr. Grindley, or of his employers;—he would have felt as, happily for the cauſe of truth and juſtice, the Jury did feel.

If thoſe who are at the bottom of theſe proſecutions had thought fit to have ſubmitted to the verdict of the Jury, and had not continued to libel the Biſhop in every newſpaper which would receive their ſcandalous paragraphs; if a vile calumniator had not been hired to diſperſe this poiſon throughout the kingdom, it is very poſſible that the outrage, of which they have been guilty, might never have been made the ſubject of diſcuſſion. The Biſhop himſelf has not thought fit to make any appeal to the public; he appears to have repoſed himſelf in a conſcience void of offence, and in the protection of the law. Indignation has now urged a man wholly unknown to the Biſhop to enter the liſts. Diſappointed, yet not unrelenting malice, ſhould find refuge no where; all honeſt men have a common intereſt in expoſing it to the broad day-light. Let theſe malignant perſecutors of the Biſhop, therefore no longer ſhelter themſelves under the venerable name and authority of the learned Judge who tried this cauſe; let them retire covered with ſhame and confuſion; and above all, let them no longer find credit with better men than themſelves, who have been drawn in, and prevailed upon to go lengths

which,

which, in their cooler moments, it is impoſſible they ſhould approve of. Let thoſe men have the generoſity to concede to the Biſhop (and the higher their rank the more generous, and the more honourable to themſelves will be the conceſſion) that in their zeal for the ſucceſs of an election they have gone too far: The Biſhop is not the man I take him to be, if he is not ready to meet them more than half way. I truſt that he is a Chriſtian Biſhop; and though not a phlegmatic man, that he has no acrimony in his temper, that his paſſions are ſubdued, and that he is in charity with all men. In this frame of mind, may he long continue to preſide over the ſee of Bangor;—the guardian of the intereſts of religion and virtue;—the hoſpitable and munificent diſpenſer of the revenues of the church within his dioceſe; the patron of indigent merit, and the poor man's friend.

My honeſt countrymen, I truſt, will ſhake off unworthy prejudices—be the ſlaves of no man, becauſe *he happens* to be a *lord*; but think for themſelves; they will then do juſtice to the exalted character of their Biſhop, and again attach themſelves, with duty and reverence, to their paſtor—a paſtor indeed, for he has *always fed his flock*. One enemy he muſt ſubmit to have;—one man has injured him too deeply ever to forgive him. It will be ſome conſolation to the Biſhop, to reflect that he is beyond the reach of that man's enmity, and that his friendſhip might undo

undo him. I appeal to both the noble Lords!—For the ſake of the dioceſe, I earneſtly hope that the Biſhop will not be tempted to change his ſituation. The dioceſe of Bangor is a ſituation worthy of the active mind, and the talents for buſineſs of the preſent Biſhop. His long and regular reſidence has been a public benefit to the country. His clergy are improved in learning, in manners, and in their habits of life, by ſeeing him living amongſt them, and by having experienced, that to be a good pariſh prieſt is a title to his favour. Beyond the exemplary diſcharge of his ſpiritual functions, by his judicious liberalities, he hath created, andkept alive, a ſpirit of induſtry in the people who live within the circle of his connections in the country. Idleneſs, and its attendant poverty, are in a great degree baniſhed from his neighbourhood. Let any man look at the town of Bangor in its preſent ſtate, and compare it with its former condition; let him enquire into the ſtate of the dioceſe; then let him lay his hand upon his breaſt, and ſay, whether the Biſhop of Bangor ſhould have been affronted, reviled, inſulted, perſecuted, and, if poſſible, driven out of the country, becauſe his character and influence were likely to bring into hazard the election of Sir Robert Williams for the county of Caernarvon.

To

To be gentle, tender-hearted, and more alive to a proper ſenſe of religion and decorum, conſtitute the amiable and diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of the fair ſex. But is is a trite adage, that there is no general rule without exception.

Who would expect that a Lady of high condition ſhould ſo far forget her rank, her dignity, and the intereſt of religion, and forget her claim to that nice ſenſibility natural to the female breaſt, as to wound the feelings of a family in a high and ſacred ſphere, to join in a wanton perſecution of a venerable character, already grievouſly harraſſed and oppreſſed; to expoſe him and the prieſthood to popular odium and public ridicule, and in his perſon, to hold up religion to the ſcoffs of the profane.

I allude to a caricature exhibited in the public print ſhops, and ſaid to proceed from a female artiſt diſtinguiſhed for this accompliſhment.—O tempora!—O mores!

But I am inclined to hope, that the better and more conſiderate part of mankind will neither commend the choice of her ſubject, nor admire the execution of it!

BRITISH MUSEUM 12 DE 79

FINIS.